

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA
11

12 JOSEPH A. NELSON,
13 Plaintiff,
14 v.
15 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:18-cv-05184-DGE

MINUTE ORDER

16
17 The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, United States District
18 Judge David G. Estudillo:

19 On December 20, 2018, Defendants Rodney Ditrich and Thurston County filed a Motion
20 for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. No. 31.) This motion sought dismissal of Plaintiff's claims
21 against Thurston County. (*Id.* at 18.) Defendant John Snaza also filed a Motion for Summary
22 Judgment (Dkt. No. 34), which Defendants Ditrich and Thurston County joined (Dkt. No. 36).

23 On March 21, 2019, Judge Ronald B. Leighton denied both Motions for Summary
24 Judgment, finding the parties' competing stories prevented summary judgment resolution of this

1 case on any theory. (Dkt. No. 109 at 5.) Defendants filed Motions for Reconsideration, which
2 were also denied. (Dkt. Nos. 113, 115.)

3 Defendants appealed the denial of summary judgment. The Ninth Circuit accepted
4 Defendants Ditrich and Snaza's appeals based on the denial of qualified immunity but did not
5 accept Thurston County's appeal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Dkt. No. 153 at 1.) *See*
6 *Horton by Horton v. City of Santa Maria*, 915 F.3d 592, 603 (9th Cir. 2019) ("The denial of
7 summary judgment to a municipal defendant on a *Monell* claim is . . . no different from the
8 denial of any ordinary motion for summary judgment, and so is not immediately appealable.").

9 On December 15, 2022, this Court held a scheduling conference with the parties. (Dkt.
10 Nos. 228, 229.) Defendants' counsel conveyed his intent to move for summary judgment on
11 Plaintiff's *Monell* claim.

12 The Court DIRECTS Defendant Thurston County to explain in no more than three pages
13 why its proposed motion for summary judgment is not precluded by its prior Motion for
14 Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 31), which has already been decided. Specifically, Defendant
15 Thurston County previously argued the absence of "evidence that Thurston County had a policy
16 or custom of any kind that relates to the constitutional claims in this action" (*Id.* at 19), which
17 Plaintiff responded to (see Dkt. No. 52 at 24-25).

18 Defendant SHALL file this explanation by January 2, 2023.

19 Dated this 15th day of December, 2022.

20 The foregoing Minute Order authorized by THE HONORABLE DAVID G.
21 ESTUDILLO, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.